

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

*F 23.4.05*  
Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

### FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/006733

International filing date (day/month/year)  
22.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
23.07.2003 *26.03*

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
A61K39/35, A61K38/01

Applicant  
BIOTECH TOOLS SA

#### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

#### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

#### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Ludwig, G

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-8698



BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/006733

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - a sequence listing
    - table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - in written format
    - in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - contained in the international application as filed.
    - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/EP2004/006733

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1.  The following document has not been furnished:

copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(a)).  
 translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43bis.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2.  This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or  
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-14
	No: Claims	

Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	
	No: Claims	1-14

Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-14 (cf. text)
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

**Item V:**

D1: US-B1-6312711

D2: Biochemical And Biophysical Research Communications (1996), 223(3),  
492-495

D3: Journal Of Food Science (1988), 54(4), 1037-1039

1. Oral desensitization is known from document D1 disclosing pharmaceutical or food compositions for treating pathologies related to graft versus host, allergic or autoimmune reactions. In D1 pepsin was used for digestion of the antigenic structures, to obtain the respective epitopes.

Document D2 discloses preparation of a haptenic peptide mixture (HPM) for the treatment of wheat allergy by digestion with **chymotrypsin**.

Document D3 investigates the efficiency of different peptidases in the production of allergy reducing epitopes from alpha-lactalbumin and β-lactoglobulin (= cow milk allergenic proteins in infant food where mother's milk cannot be provided).

**Chymotrypsin** alone was as effective as its combination with trypsin, whereas the combination of **chymotrypsin** with pepsin was most effective.

2. Oral desensitization with chymotrypsin-produced epitopes of allergenic proteins was therefore known in the art as disclosed in documents D2 and D3.

Claims 1, and 9-11 are not regarded as inventive in view of document D2 or D3 when combined with document D1 (Art. 52(1) and 56 EPC). This objection also holds for the rest of the claims.

3. For the assessment of the present claims 8-9 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist in the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize as industrially applicable the subject-matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, claims to a known compound for first use in medical treatment and the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/006733

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**